DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 285 JC 810 206

AUTHOR Smith, Albert B.
TITLE Staff Development Practices in U. S. Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 80
NOTE 90p.
AVAILABLE FROM AACJC National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development, Vice President for Publications, Hocking Technical College, Nelsonville, OH 45764 ($3.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; Evaluation Criteria; Faculty Evaluation; Financial Support; National Surveys; Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Sabbatical Leaves; *Staff Development; Tables (Data); Teacher Participation; Teacher Workshops; Training Objectives; Trend Analysis; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A nationwide survey of 1,315 community colleges was conducted in 1979 to draw a profile of the colleges' staff development practices. A 12-page survey instrument asked respondents to: (1) identify the goals of the staff development program; (2) estimate the effectiveness of the instructional methods used in these programs, as well as the methods used to evaluate instructor performance; (3) estimate the effectiveness of staff development practices used by the college, such as sabbatical leaves and travel grants; (4) indicate the participation of various faculty and staff groups in staff development activities; (5) identify the sources of program funding; (6) describe the organizational structure of staff development programs; and (7) indicate the criteria used to evaluate these programs and the degree to which these criteria had been met. Selected findings indicate that, of the 687 responding colleges, 413 had organized staff development programs. The most frequently mentioned program goals centered on the development of faculty, rather than non-teaching staff, and the availability of travel funds was rated the most effective staff development activity. Only 25% of the colleges had completed a full evaluation of their staff development programs, and few were able to report that evaluation criteria had been met. The survey report details and compares findings, where possible, with those of a similar 1976 study. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200285

NATIONAL RESEARCH PROJECT ON THE STATUS OF STAFF, PROGRAM, AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Al Smith
University of Florida

NCSPOD

NCSPOD is an Affiliate Council of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Al Smith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 810 306

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN U.S. COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Albert B. Smith

Publications Commission
AACJC National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development (NCS-POD)
Lexington, Kentucky

Partially Supported by a grant from the AACJC National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development (NCS-POD)

January, 1980

Contents

List of Tables iii

Chapter 1. Introduction and Design of the Study 1

Research Questions 1

Methodology 2

The survey questionnaire 4

Overview 5

Chapter 2. Nature and Use of Staff Development Goals 6

Chapter 3. Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices 14

Workshops, Seminars, and Programs 14

Analysis or Assessment Practices 16

Media, Technology and Course Development Practices 20

Miscellaneous Practices 23

Institution-Wide Policies or Practices 25

Summary 27

Chapter 4. Participation in and the Organization and Funding of Development Activities 30

Staff Involvement 30

Organization of Programs 33

Funding of Programs 34

Chapter 5. Program Evaluation 38

A Criterion-Referenced Evaluation Model 38

Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Program 40

Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty 42

Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Administration 44

Contents (cont.)

	Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Institution	49
	Summary	50
Chapter 6.	Some Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations	56
	Goal Setting	56
	Development Activities	57
	Participation, Organization, and Funding	59
	Program Evaluation	61
	A Final Word	62
References		63
Appendix A.	Initial Letter and Survey Questionnaire	64

List of Tables

Table 1.	Six Most Frequently Mentioned Goals for Community Colleges with Staff Development Programs	7
Table 2.	Seven Least Mentioned Goals for Community Colleges with Staff Development Programs	9
Table 3.	Rank Order Listing of Remaining Nineteen Goals for Community College Staff Development Programs According to Goal Usage	11
Table 4.	Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practice: Workshops, Seminars, Programs	15
Table 5.	Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices: Analysis or Assessment Practices	18
Table 6.	Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices: Media, Technology, and Course Development	21
Table 7.	Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practice Miscellaneous Practices	24
Table 8.	Estimated Effectiveness in Institution-Wide Policies or Practices in Development	26
Table 9.	Effectiveness Ratings of the Four Most Highly Rated Development Practices Compared to the Estimated Effectiveness Ratings Found in Centra's (1973) Research	29
Table 10.	A Comparison of the Estimated Extent to which Various Groups of Staff Members Have Been Involved in Development Activities from 1976 to 1979	31
Table 11.	Percentage of Total Annual Institutional budgets Allocated for Community College Staff Development Activities	35
Table 12.	A Comparison of Funding Changes in the Proportion of the Annual Institutional Budget Used for Staff Development	37
Table 13.	Evaluation of Staff Development Programs or Activities in Community Colleges, 1976 and 1979	39
Table 14.	Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Programs	41
Table 15.	Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty	45

List of Tables (cont.)

Table 16. Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria for Judging Effect on the Administration

Table 17. Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Institution

Table 18. Rank Ordering of the Five Most Frequently Used Criteria for the Evaluation of Community College Staff Development Programs

Table 19. Rank Ordering of Six Most Frequently Met Criteria for the Evaluation of Community College Staff Development Programs

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In 1976 John Centra conducted a study to determine the status of faculty development programs in colleges and universities throughout the United States. Three hundred and twenty-six of the 756 colleges in that study were two-year institutions. That study collected data via a four-page questionnaire on the (1) estimated use and effectiveness of development practices, (2) extent of faculty member involvement in development practices, and (3) organization and funding of faculty development programs. This current study, three years later, in part replicated Centra's (1976) study, Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities, and updated some of his data in the three previously mentioned areas.

Research Questions

This study also answered some questions that Centra did not raise or could not raise because of the nature of his research. These questions were as follows:

1. What goals are being used in community college staff development (SD) programs? (Chapter 2)

2. What changes have occurred since 1976 in the estimated effectiveness of selected staff development practices in two-year colleges? (Chapter 3)

3. What is the estimated effectivess of selected staff development programs for non-teaching staff in the community college? (Chapter 3)

4. Has the nature of faculty involvement in staff development programs changed significantly over the last three years? (Chapter 4)

5. What trends have developed since 1976 in the funding,

organization, and evaluation of staff development programs in community colleges? (Chapter 4)

6. What criteria are being used to evaluate two-year staff development programs? (Chapter 5)

7 What success do directors of staff development programs feel they have had in meeting the evaluation standards or criteria they have set for their programs? (Chapter 5)

Answers to these questions are reported here.

In this report the term "staff development" is used to encompass the broad range of activities institutions use to renew or assist faculty, administrators, support staff, counselors, librarians, clerical personnel, and other non-academic staff. "Staff development is becoming the most widely used label for development activities in the community college field. It is viewed in this report as the umbrella term that best encompasses the direction development efforts are taking in two-year colleges. Staff was defined here as all employees of the college.

Methodology

The study began in April 1979 with a letter and twelve-page questionnaire sent to the academic dean of every community college in the United States. (See Appendix A) This letter informed the deans that a national survey of two-year college staff development programs is being conducted under the sponsorship of the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCS-POD), one of several Councils of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). Both staff development, faculty development, instructional improvement, and organizational development goals, activities, and evaluation criteria were specified because these types of programs or program characteristics were of interest.

A total of 1,315 questionnaires were mailed to community colleges throughout the United States. Six hundred eighty-seven questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 52 percent. Of those responses 413 colleges, or 60 percent of those responding, indicated that their college had an organized program or set of practices for staff development or instructional improvement. Another 241 colleges, or 35 percent of the respondents, returned their questionnaires uncompleted, stating that they did not have a program at this time. (The remaining 33 responses, or 5 percent, were judged unusable for various reasons, i.e. missing pages, missing information, etc.)

Assuming that non-responding institutions were less likely to have programs, one could estimate that perhaps half of the two-year colleges in the United States currently provide some sort of program or set of development activities for their staff. These findings and assumptions are consistent with Centra's data and views. Of course, this estimate would depend on how institutions chose to interpret the question--particularly as to what constitutes a program or set of practices. Nevertheless, it would appear that there are a large number of community colleges that either do not have the interest or the resources to establish an organized staff development program.

In general, the questionnaires were completed by a coordinator or director of staff development, a dean or associate dean, or a faculty member spending part-time as a coordinator of development activities. Their estimates of the use and effectiveness of the various practices and evaluation criteria can be expected to be somewhat more positive than those provided by faculty members or others. And the estimates are generally just that--estimates. Most of the respondents did not have

hard data on hand to answer each question. They judged the effectiveness of the practices and the degree to which evaluation criteria were being met as they perceived the situation. Nevertheless, because of their overall knowledge of the development activities on their campuses and because of some of their more recent attempts to evaluate their programs, most respondents were in a good position to provide estimations concerning the effectiveness of various practices and the degree to which their standards were being met.

The survey questionnaire. A review of the literature and discussions with people involved in staff or instructional development resulted in a preliminary questionnaire that was field tested in three colleges. The final questionnaire (see Appendix A) included the following categories: Staff Development Goals, Staff Development Practices Participation, Funding, Organization, and Criteria for Evaluating Staff Development Programs. The 31 survey goals were adapted with permission from those used by Robert T. Blackburn and his staff in their 1979 Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education grant on the assessment of faculty development programs at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Many of the 48 development practices used in the second half of the questionnaire, along with the questions related to participation and organization, were adapted and reprinted in the questionnaire with permission from the Educational Testing Service. The "Criteria for Evaluating Staff Development Programs" was adapted and reprinted in the last section of the questionnaire from Evaluating Teaching Improvement Programs (1978) by William R. O'Connell, Jr. and L. Richard Meeth with permission of the Council on

Learning and Change Magazine Press.

Overview

The remaining chapters of this report discuss the nature and use of staff development goals (Chapter 2), the estimated effectiveness of various development practices (Chapter 3), participation in and the funding and organization of activities (Chapter 4), and the nature, use, and achievement of criteria for evaluating staff development programs (Chapter 5). The final chapter summarizes the major findings and discusses some implications.

Staff development goals and evaluation criteria are highlighted here because they were not discussed in Centra's research. Comparisons with Centra's study were not possible in these areas. However, in the area of perceived effectiveness of selected staff development activities, comparisons were possible and trends in perceptions, if any, have been noted.

Chapter 2

NATURE AND USE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Thirty-one staff development goal statements taken from the literature and/or inferred from conversations with practitioners were included in the first section of the final questionnaire (see Appendix A, pp. 1-3 of the questionnaire). Each respondent was asked to identify which of the 31 goals was a part of his/her staff development program. A wide range of use was found for these goal statements. From as few as 174 colleges with staff development programs indicating that a particular goal was part of their program, to as many as 380 colleges noting use of a particular goal. This finding alone illustrates the wide variety of goals employed in development programs.

Table 1 lists the six most frequently mentioned goals for institutions with programs. The two most frequently mentioned goals are consistent with the teaching mission of the community college, i.e., to increase staff responsiveness to student needs (Goal #1) and to increase faculty knowledge of the teaching learning process (Goal #8). The other goals listed in Table 1 also relate to the general area of "improving teaching." Of particular interest, however, was the frequency with which the goal "to reduce student attrition" was mentioned. This may be a fairly new goal to many staff development programs. Its presence can probably be explained by the current concern over actual and anticipated enrollment declines in postsecondary education and the community college movement's recognition that the reduction of student attrition is one of the best ways to counteract such declines.

Table 1

Six Most Frequently Mentioned Goals for Community Colleges with Staff Development Programs (N = 413)

Goal Statement	No. of Colleges Using the Goal	Percentage of Total Sample (%)
1. To increase staff (faculty, administrator, support personnel, clerical, etc.) responsiveness to student needs.	380	92
8. To increase the faculty's knowledge about the teaching-learning process.	368	89
31. To increase the faculty's skills in instruction.	360	87
9. To create a climate in which the attainment of effective teaching is the ongoing concern.	344	83
20. To increase the faculty's repertoire of teaching methods.	332	80
10. To reduce student attrition.	325	79

Also of interest in Table 1 is the finding that the most frequently mentioned goals appear to focus primarily on faculty development. This find suggests that community colleges still see faculty development as the major area for focus in their staff development programs. This view is balanced, however, by responses to some of the other 31 goal statements i.e., (1) 72 percent (N = 296) of the colleges sought to 'enhance the staff's personal growth and self-actualization", (2) 69 percent (N = 283)

sought to "provide professional development opportunities for the college's academic support staff", (3) 67 percent (N= 277) were trying to "provide professional development opportunities for the college's administrative staff", (4) 60 percent (N = 247) were attempting to "increase the effectiveness of part-time faculty", and (5) 57 percent (N = 236) had as one of their goals "to improve the performance of non-academic staff. . .".

Table 2 lists the six least mentioned development goals for colleges with programs. Of significance here is the fact that less than 50 percent of the colleges with programs saw one of their goals to be "to encourage staff to examine their central values and beliefs concerning education or work" or "to facilitate a staff member's ability to participate in institutional decision-making." One might have hypothesized that these goals would have appeared more frequently given what we know about the importance of values and involvement in the personal and organizational change process. Perhaps we will see these other less frequently used goals increase in importance as colleges realize their value in times of declining resources.

As we enter the 1980's, it is also surprising that no more than 50 percent of the staff development programs studied have as their goal the desire "to help staff retrain for assuming responsibilities in new areas", or "to initiate a periodic review of the performance of all staff members." The next decade promises to be a time for program changes and increased accountability for all postsecondary institutions and personnel. For these reasons these goals should probably be adopted by more college staff development officers.

Table 2

Seven Least Mentioned Goals for

Colleges with Staff Development Programs

(N = 413)

	Goal Statement	No. of Colleges Using the Goal	Percentage of Total Sample (%)
12.	To encourage staff to examine their central values and beliefs concerning education or work.	174	42
7.	To help staff retrain for assuming responsibilities in new areas.	175	42
6.	To facilitate a staff member's ability to participate in institutional decision-making.	193	47
14.	To initiate a periodic review of the performance of all staff members.	209	49
28.	To increase staff satisfaction with their work.	226	55
22.	To stimulate and assist academic departments in meeting their goals.	227	55
5.	To increase administrators' knowledge of the needs, resources, barriers to, and strategies for teaching improvement.	228	55

The fact that goal number 28 was not used in more than 55 percent of the staff development programs may be a result of the present high level of job satisfaction found among community college staff. Benoit (1978), for example, found high job satisfaction among Florida community college faculty. The relatively lower use of the goal "to stimulate and assist academic departments in meeting their goals" is more difficult to explain. The emphasis in community college staff development programs to date has been on working with individual staff members as opposed to organizational units. Perhaps as resources decline and greater attention is given to organization development, we will see more colleges adopting this goal.

Table 3 shows in rank order the frequency with which the remaining nineteen goals were mentioned by the staff development (SD) officers surveyed. It is obvious from this data and the data reported in the previous Tables 1 and 2, that a variety of goals are used in the average community college staff development program. This finding no doubt is a result of the many demands placed on staff development officers by different publics within the academic community. This finding raised the question as to whether or not a given staff development program can be effective with a wide range of goal statements in any given year. One wonders whether or not some of these staff development programs may have weakened their impact by trying to do too much. Future research may want to examine these and other research questions to see if there is any relationship between the number of goals a program adopts and its impact on an institution and its staff.

Of particular interest in Table 3 is the finding that 300 colleges

Table 3

Rank Order Listing of Remaining Nineteen Goals for Community College Staff Development Programs According to Goal Usage

(N = 413)

Goal Statement	No. of Colleges Using the Goal	Percentage of Total Sample (%)
4. To increase academic innovation.	324	79
27. To maximize the use of available teaching-learning resources.	309	75
21. To improve the faculty's ability to plan and develop courses of instruction designed to facilitate the achievement of clearly articulated objectives.	301	73
30. To increase student learning.	300	73
13. To enhance the staff's personal growth and self-actualization.	296	72
15. To provide professional development opportunities for the college's academic support staff, i.e., counselors, librarians, etc.	283	69
3. To provide professional development opportunities for the college's administrative staff.	277	67
18. To improve the faculty's ability to evaluate student performance.	275	67
23. To acquaint staff with current issues and trends in higher educaiton.	274	66

Table 3 (cont.)

Rank Order Listing of Remaining Nineteen Goals for Community College Staff Development Programs According to Goal Usage

(N = 413)

	Goal Statement	No. of Colleges Using the Goal	Percentage of Total Sample (%)
19.	To increase student motivation to learn.	258	63
11.	To acquaint staff with the distinct mission and objectives of their institution.	258	63
24.	To increase interpersonal contact and a sense of community among staff	251	61
2.	To increase the effectiveness of part-time faculty	247	60
29.	To renew faculty interest in teaching.	246	60
16.	To increase staff interpersonal skills.	242	59
17.	To increase staff productivity.	242	59
26.	To instill a sense of importance about teaching and a sense of personal and professional worth about teaching.	240	58
25.	To improve the performance of non-academic staff, i.e., clerical, maintenance personnel, etc.	236	57

have stated that one of their SD goals is number 30, "To increase student learning." While this is perhaps the most appropriate goal for a staff development program, one wonders how many colleges have evaluated their staff development programs in terms of their impact in this area. Also of interest is the finding that 247 colleges (60 percent) had as one of their goals "To increase the effectiveness of part-time faculty." Given the large and increasing number of part-time faculty employed by two-year colleges, one might have expected to have found an even larger number of staff development programs using this goal. Finally, it can be seen in Table 3 that 242 colleges indicated that goal number 17, "To increase faculty productivity", was one of their goals. This goal will no doubt come into greater use if and when two-year colleges encounter declining enrollments and resources in the 1980's.

Overall, Tables 1, 2, and 3 in this chapter provide a useful list of goals for staff development officers in the community college field. These 31 goals can be used by staff development officers to see if their goals are the same as those used by other two-year colleges around the country. This list of goals should also be a very useful resource to staff development officers who are seeking new ideas or directions for their programs.

Chapter 3

ESTIMATED EFFECTIVENESS OF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

This chapter discusses the respondent's ratings of the effectiveness of 48 development practices. The 48 practices had been grouped into five categories: workshops, seminars, programs; analysis and assessment practices; media, technology, and course development; miscellaneous practices; and institution-wide practices.

Workshops, Seminars, and Programs

From the list of nine topics that might be the focus of workshops, seminars, or similar presentations, 58 percent of the respondents indicated that "Workshops or presentations that explore various methods or techniques of instruction" were "effective" or "very effective." (See Table 4) Similarly, 57 percent of the respondents said that "Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field" were "effective" or "very effective." While the ratings for these programs were not as high as Centra (1976) found in his study (63 and 63 percent, respectively), the indication is that these are still the two most effective programs in the eyes of program directors. Other programs of this nature with more than 50 percent of the respondents indicating they were "effective" or "very effective" include "Workshops, seminars, or programs to acquaint staff with goals of the insitution and types of students enrolled" (item 4), "Workshops, seminars, or short courses for administrators" (item 7), and "Workshops, seminars, or short courses for non-academic staff" (item 8).

Workshops, seminars, or programs that appear to have dropped in terms

Table 4

Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practice:
Workshops, Seminars, Programs
(N = 413)

Practice	Estimated Effectiveness[a] Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra 1976) (%)	Percentage Difference (%)
1. Workshops or presentations that explore various methods or techniques of instruction.	58	63	-5
2. Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field.	57	63	-6
3. Workshops or seminars dealing with new or different approaches to develop curricula.	50	54	-4
4. Workshops, seminars, or programs to acquaint staff with goals of the institution and types of students enrolled.	53	55	-2
5. Workshops, seminars, or programs to improve the management of departmental operations.	41	55	-14
6. Workshops or program in faculty affective development.	40	51	-11
7. Workshops, seminars, or short courses for administrators.	54[b]		
8. Workshops, seminars, or short courses for non-academic staff.	56[b]		
9. Workshops, seminars, or short courses for part-time faculty.	42[b]		

[a]Percentages based only on institutions at which practice exists.

[b]Activities not included in Centra's research.

of their perceived effectiveness since Centra's (1976) research are "Workshops, seminars, or programs to improve the management of departmental operations" (item 5), and "Workshops or programs in faculty affective development" (item 6). Specific reasons for the drop in the percentage of respondents rating these two programs as "very effective" or "effective" (declines of 14 and 11 percent, respectively) are not clear. However, the decline in ratings for these two areas may be due to the complexity of the tasks and the difficulty in measuring outcomes in these two areas. "Workshops, seminars, and short courses for part-time faculty" were viewed by only 42 percent of the respondents as being "very effective" or "effective". This relatively low rating for an activity that was not studied in Centra's (1976) investigation suggests that there is plenty of room for improvement in terms of these types of development programs for adjunct faculty.

Overall, the effectiveness ratings for workshops were not high, suggesting that other types of staff development practices hold greater promise. It does appear, however, that the idea of total staff development is taking hold in this area. Workshops, seminars, short courses, and related programs for other than the full-time teaching staff are in use in a fairly large number of institutions.

Analysis or Assessment Practices

Estimates of the effectiveness of 12 analysis and assessment practices are reported in Table 5. One overall observation can be made immediately from the data outlined in this table. Analysis and assessment practices in general are viewed by staff development coordinators as

being less effective development strategies than they were three years ago. Declines in the percentage of respondents indicating that the first seven items in Table 5 were either "very effective" or "effective" ranged from a drop of 7 percent to 17 percent from 1976 to 1979. In 1976, for example, Centra found that 58 percent of the respondents to his study who were using systematic student ratings of instructors by students for faculty improvement (item 1) felt this practice was either a "very effective" or "effective" faculty development practice. In comparison, only 43 percent of the respondents using this practice in this survey found this practice to be "very effective" or "effective" in their colleges, a drop of 15 percent. Other analysis and assessment practices receiving less favorable ratings since 1976, as shown in Table 5 were: "2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment forms)", "3. Systematic teachings on course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purpose", "4. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement", "5. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching", "6. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction", and "9. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members."

Two of the more effective analysis or assessment practices today appear to be: (1) faculty with expertise consulting with other faculty on teaching and course development [item 7], and (2) professional and personal development plans for individual faculty members (item 9]. Of the new practices listed for evaluation in this study professional and

Table 5

Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices:

Analysis or Assessment Practices

(N = 413)

Practice	Estimated Effectiveness[a] Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra, 1976) (%)	Percentage Difference (%)
1. Systematic ratings of instruction by students used to help faculty improve.	43	58	-15
2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment form).	38	55	-17
3. Systematic teaching or course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purposes.	41	47	-6
4. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement.	47	61	-14
5. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching.	42	56	-14
6. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction.	46	66	-20
7. Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement.	57	64	-7

Table 5 (cont.)

Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices:

Analysis or Assessment Practices

(N = 413)

Practice	Estimated Effectiveness[a] Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra 1975) (%)	Percentage Difference (%)
8. "Master teachers" or senior faculty work closely with new or apprentice teachers.	51	62	-11
9. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members.	56	71	-15
10. Faculty evaluation of college administrators.	31[b]		
11. Annual evaluation for all college staff members.	46[b]		
12. Professional and personal development plans for all staff members.	48[b]		

[a]Percentages based only on institutions at which practice exists.

[b]Activities not included in Centra's research.

personal development, plans for all staff members [item 12], and annual evaluations for all college staff members [item 11] appear to hold the most promise. However, improvements are needed with these two programs, along with programs for the formal evaluation of college administrators, since fewer than 50 percent of the respondents who had such programs rated them as being either "effective" or "very effective".

Media, Technology, and Course Development Practice

Most of the eight practices in this category involve specialists providing teaching assistance to faculty. (Table 6). One of the more widely used practices in 1976 was the use of specialists on campus to assist faculty in the use of audio-visual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television (item 1, Table 6). It is assumed that this practice continues in high use today and as one can see from ratings in this study, this practice has the highest effectiveness rating (66%) in this area, as it did in 1976 when 74% of Centra's respondents viewed that practice as being either "effective" or "very effective".

The lower effectiveness ratings of the media, technology, and course development practices in this study, with the exception of perhaps the use of specialists to assist full-time faculty in the use of audio-visual aids (item 1), suggest that staff development programs need to carefully consider their commitment to employing specialists to assist faculty. It may be that faculty would prefer to draw upon each other's expertise rather than having to rely on a specialist every time they need some assistance. Another possible explanation of the lower ratings for practices in this area may be found in the nature of the development practices. Could it be that as the staff development movement has matured

Table 6

Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices:

Media, Technology, and Course Development

(N = 413)

Practice	Estimated Effectiveness[a] Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra, 1976) (%)	Percentage Difference (%)
1. Specialist on campus to assist faculty in use of audio-visual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television.	66	74	-8
2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid (e.g., programmed learning or computer-assisted instruction).	49	61	-12
3. Specialists to assist faculty in constructing tests or evaluating student performance.	35	51	-16
4. Specialist to assist individual faculty in instructional course development by consulting on course objectives and course design.	49	69	-20
5. Specialist to help faculty develop teaching skills such as lecturing or leading discussions, or to encourage use of different teaching-learning strategies such as individualized instruction.	42	61	-19

Table 6 (Cont.)

Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices:

Media, Technology, and Course Development

(N = 413)

	Estimated Effectiveness[a]		
	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra 1976)	Percentage Difference (%)
6. Outside consultants to assist administrators with latest technology and management practice.	41[b]		
7. Specialists on campus to assist part-time faculty with media, technology, and course development.	44[b]		
8. Outside consultants to assist non-academic support staff in using latest technology and practice.	38[b]		

[a]Percentages based only on institutions at which practice exists.

[b]Activities not included in Centra's research.

faculty have acquired the necessary basic skills in the use of instructional technology, test construction, course objective writing and design, and in various teaching strategies? Perhaps the more effective programs in the future will be those that place more emphasis on faculty grants, independent study or travel, and less emphasis on workshops or the use of outside specialists.

Of the new practices listed in Table 6 (items 6-8) that did not appear in Centra's research, the use of specialists on campus to assist part-time faculty with media, technology, and course development (item 7) received the highest effectiveness rating (44 percent). None of the three new items, however, were viewed as having great success, i.e., 50 percent or more of the respondents perceiving their programs to be either "effective" or "very effective".

Miscellaneous Practices

At least three of the miscellaneous practices listed in Table 7 appear to merit continued attention as viable staff development practices. Respondents to this study considered the "Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching" (item 1, Table 6), and "Faculty visitations to other institutions to review educational programs or innovative projects" (item 2) to be two effective staff development practices. Another very popular program in terms of its effectiveness is item 7 in Table 7, "Non-Academic staff tuition waiver programs for individuals taking courses in their colleges." This activity was not listed in Centra's study but the positive responses found here suggest the positive value of this program. It is a particularly interesting development program because of the emphasis

Table 7

Estimated Effectiveness of Development Practices:

Miscellaneous Practices

(N = 413)

Practice	Estimated Effectiveness[a] Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra, 1976) (%)	Percentage Difference (%)
1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching.	70	75	-5
2. Faculty visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this insitution) to review educational programs or innovative projects.	68	71	-3
3. Faculty take courses offered by colleagues.	43	54	-11
4. Personal counseling provided individual faculty members on career goals and other personal development areas.	45	54	-9
5. Sabbatical leaves for administrators.	46[b]		
6. Paid or unpaid leaves for non-academic staff for professional development purposes.	47[b]		
7. Non-academic staff tuition waiver program for individuals taking courses in the colleges.	64[b]		

[a]Percentages based only on institutions at which practice exists.

[b]Activities not included in Centra's research.

it places on the utilization of a college's own resources for staff development as opposed to the use of external groups.

The ratings for the first and second practices listed in Table 7 have not changed much since 1976 when 75 percent and 71 percent of the respondents to Centra's questionnaire rated these practices as being either "very effective" or "effective". The percentage difference in the ratings was only 5 and 3 percent. So far, these two development practices represent the most effective staff development practices reviewed in this study.

Institution-Wide Policies or Practices

Twelve institution-wide policies or practices are listed in Table 8, along with the percentage of respondents indicating the practice was "effective" or "very effective" in 1979 or 1976. The most effective practices in this area today appears to be: item 8, "Travel" funds available to attend professional conferences"; item 10, "Summer" grants for projects to improve instruction or courses"; and item 7, "Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field." These practices were rated as being effective by over 65 percent of the respondents who used them in both this study and Centra's. Again we see grants and travel programs emerging as key staff development practices in two year colleges.

In addition to the practices already mentioned from Table 8, there appears in this table a number of other fairly effective development programs. These include: professional development days (Item 1), periodic review of all faculty members (item 2), sabbatical leaves (item 3), a campus staff or faculty development committee (item 11) and needs assessment for program goals and priorities (item 12). Three of these five

Table 8

Estimated Effectiveness in Institution-Wide Policies or Practices in Development

(N = 413)

Practice	Estimated Effectiveness[a] Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra, 1976) (%)	Percentage Difference (%)
1. A specific calendar period is set aside for professional development.	59	52	+7
2. There is periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not.	60	63	-3
3. Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary.	62	60	+2
4. A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or developmental purposes.	55	47	+8
5. Lighter than normal teaching load for first-year faculty.	32	64	-32
6. Temporary teaching load reduction to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area.	53	68	-15
7. Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field.	67	67	
8. Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.	73	69	+4
9. "Visiting scholars" program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods.	45	70	-25
10. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses.	69	72	-3
11. There is a campus committee on staff or faculty development.	62	55	+7
12. Needs assessment conducted to determine program goals and priorities.	60[b]		

[a] Percentages based only on institutions at which practice exists.
[b] Activity not included in Centra's research.

items (practices 1, 2, and 11) showed an increase since 1976 in the percentage of respondents rating them as "very effective"or "effective" activities. In fact, this is the first set of practices that showed higher ratings than were found in Centra's study.

While a number of institution-wide practices received higher effectiveness scores than they did in Centra's project, there were two practices that received much lower effectiveness ratings than they did in 1976. These two activities were: "Lighter than normal teaching load for first-year faculty." (item 5), and "'Visting scholars program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods" (Item 9). These lower ratings, along with the lower rating given to "Temporary teaching load reductions to work on new course, major course revision, or research area.", may all be related to the fact that in times of declining financial resources and enrollments, colleges simply cannot afford these staff development programs. Another equally valid explanation may be that as a result of evaluation studies over the last three years two-year colleges have found better ways for stimulating growth and development among their new as well as their more experienced faculty.

In summary, it is encouraging in this section to see that better than 60 percent of the program directors rate the use of staff development committees and the use of needs assessment techniques as effective programs. It is this writer's view that these are two essential and basic components of an effective staff development program.

Summary

Of the development practices rated in both Centra's study and this research, four ranked among the five most highly rated practices in both

studies. These four items, along with the percentages indicating the program coordinator or director's estimations of effectiveness, are listed in Table 9. In summary, individuals responsible for running staff development programs still see the most effective staff development programs to be ones that involve the awarding of grants to people and the use of staff development funds for staff travel. This finding suggests that colleges with limited dollars for staff development programs should probably place most of their efforts in the development of mini-grants programs for program development and related travel projects.

Development practices rated as effective in this study by 60 percent or more of the respondents that were not listed in Centra's 45 practices included:

> Non-academic staff tuition waiver program for individuals taking courses in the colleges. (item 7, Table 7, p 24)
>
> Needs assessment conducted to determine program goals and priorities. (item 12, Table 8, p. 26)

Staff development directors and committees may want to include these activities in their programs if they have not done so already. Both would appear to be important programs, particularly needs assessment in a time of increased emphasis on the evaluation of staff development programs.

Table 9

Effectiveness Ratings of the Four Most Highly Rated Development Practices Compared to the Estimated Effectiveness Ratings Found in Centra's (1976) Research

	Practice	Estimated Effectiveness[a] Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Smith, 1979) (%)	Percentage Indicating Effective or Very Effective (Centra 1976) (%)	Percentage Difference (%)
III. 8.	Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.	73	69	+4
II.D.1.	Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching.	70	75	-5
III.10.	Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses.	69	72	-3
II.D.2.	Faculty visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this institution) to renew educational programs or innovative projects.	68	71	-3

[a]Percentages based only on institutions at which practice exists.

Chapter 4

PARTICIPATION IN AND THE ORGANIZATION AND FUNDING OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first part reports the respondents' perceptions of staff member involvement in their development activities or programs. The second section describes briefly trends in the internal organization of staff development programs and in external consortium arrangements. The final part outlines funding trends in these programs.

Staff Involvement

Ten broad descriptions of staff members were limited in the questionnaire: younger faculty in their first years of teaching, faculty with over 15 or 20 years of teaching experience, non-tenured faculty, tenured faculty, good teachers who want to get better, faculty who really need to improve, part-time faculty, college administrators (including department chairmen), clerical staff, and other non-academic support staff. The first six broad descriptions were included in Centra's (1976) study The groups are not mutually exclusive, but do represent the broad spectrum of personnel employed by two-year colleges. Respondents estimated the extent to which each group of faculty was involved in faculty development practices at their institutions. The results are presented in Table 10.

One interpretation of the responses is that sizable numbers of staff members have been involved in the various programs. The tenured and non-tenured faculty groups encompass essentially all instructors on campus, and as Table 10 indicates, at almost a fourth of the community colleges

Table 10

A Comparison of the Estimated Extent to which Various Groups of Staff Members Have Been Involved in Development Activities from 1976 to 1979

	Percentage of 413 institutional respondents indicating:				
	Very Few	Some	About Half	Most	No Response
1. Younger faculty in their first years of teaching.	8 (13)[a]	32 (31)	21 (23)	35 (27)	5 (06)
2. Faculty with over 15 or 20 years of teaching experience.	15 (22)	44 (45)	18 (17)	13 (09)	9 (07)
3. Non-tenured faculty	4 (08)	23 (34)	24 (25)	25 (19)	25 (14)
4. Tenured faculty	6 (09)	29 (41)	21 (23)	16 (10)	28 (17)
5. Good teachers who want to get better.	1 (03)	17 (21)	28 (28)	47 (43)	7 (05)
6. Faculty who really need to improve.	37 (40)	9 (38)	10 (08)	6 (06)	8 (08)
7. Part-time faculty	46	23	10	5	17
8. College administrators (including department chairpersons)	8	32	24	27	8
9. Clerical Staff	28	25	1.	12	18
10. Other non-academic support staff	31	29	13	5	23

[a]Percentages in parentheses represent the percentage of 756 two-year college, four-year college, and university respondents selecting the particular response in Centra's study in 1976.

"about half" of these two groups combined were involved. This was also true of the college administrators group. Unfortunately, however, some critical faculty and non-faculty groups were only minimally involved, as the following discussion points out.

Among the six types of faculty groups, the most active participants were "good teachers who wanted to get better": respondents at about 75 percent of the institutions in 1979 said half or more of their faculty were involved. This compared to 71 percent of this same group in Centra's study of 756 two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities. Younger faculty in their first years of teaching were moderately involved in activities (at 56 percent of the two-year colleges in 1979, about half or more of the younger faculty were involved). Since Centra did not report comparative data in this and many other areas of involvement, it is not possible to tell whether or not this was a significant increase in younger faculty involvement. Older faculty--those with over 15 or 20 years of teaching experience--were only slightly active relative to the other groups with 31 percent of the institutions saying half or more of this faculty group were involved. There was some difference between the non-tenured and tenured faculty participation with the non-tenured group showing greater participation.

It is especially important to note that faculty in their first year or two of teaching and non-tenured faculty appear to the moderately involved in development activities, while those with over 15 or 20 years of experience or tenured are only slightly involved. With fewer new faculty and increasingly tenured-in faculties it would appear that more attention needs to be given to involving older tenured faculty in future development programs.

Participation of part-time faculty, college administrators, clerical staff, and non-academic support staff in development activities was not studied by Centra (1976). Table 10 does, however, report participation rates for these groups in the community college. College administrators (including department chairpersons) had the highest participation rate of these four groups. Respondents at 51 percent of the 413 colleges said half or more of their administrators were involved. The next most active non-full-time faculty group appears to be the clerical staff with 29 percent of the colleges reporting half or more of this group's involvement in development programs. Other non-academic support staff and part-time faculty are the least involved groups in development activities in two-year colleges, according to this study's respondents. The participation rate of part-time faculty is particularly surprising when one considers that part-time faculty now outnumber full-time faculty in the community college field by an almost 2 to 1 ratio. Forty-six percent of the respondents indicated that "very few" of their part-time faculty are involved in development work and only 15 percent of the institutions showed half or more of their part-time faculty were involved.

Organization of Programs

It has been recommended that there be some kind of unit or system on each campus to help coordinate and plan faculty development activities. (Eble, 1971; Group for Human Development in Higher Education, 1974). Hammons (1978) has made a similar recommendation for staff development programs that would contain a faculty development component. Centra (1976) found in his study that just under half (44 percent) of the 756 institutions in his sample reported having units or persons that

coordinated the development activities on their campuses. Forty-nine percent of the 326 two-year colleges in his study had such units.

In this investigation 53 percent of 392 two-year colleges with development programs reported having a unit or person responsible for staff development, an increase of 4 percent over Centra's findings. This would appear to be a positive trend---an indication that coordinated staff development programs are gaining in visibility and program status in the community college field. However, with just over half of the colleges reporting such organizational or administrative arrangements, there is still a great need for greater organization of staff development efforts in this segment of American higher education.

Consortia or regional groups are on the increase in the community college field. Thirty-two percent of the colleges with development programs reported involvement in consortia or regional groups in 1979 This organizational arrangement is up from the 24 percent found in Centra's study which also had 87 fewer colleges. It may be that smaller colleges or colleges with stable or declining resources are overcoming a lack of funds through this type of cooperative venture.

Funding of Programs

The expansion of development programs will depend on the availability of funds for such programs in the 1980's. Data presented in Table 11 indicates that at the present time staff development finding usually represents one percent or less of a college's budget. Sixty-six percent of the 362 respondents that answered this question on the survey instrument indicated that their staff development received between zero and one percent of their college's annual budget. Another 102 respondents

Table 11

Percentage of Total Annual Institutional Budgets

Allocated for Community College Staff Development Activities

(N = 362)

Percentage of Budget	No. of Colleges Making Percentage Allocation	Percentage of Colleges Surveyed
0- 1%	237	66.0
2- 4%	102	28.0
5- 7%	18	5.0
8-10%	1	.3
over 10%	4	1.1

said that they received two to four percent of their college's annual budget dollars. Only four colleges reported that their staff development budget exceeded 10 percent of the college budget. In the light of anticipated real dollar community college budget declines in the next few years, it will become even more difficult for directors of staff development programs to maintain, let alone expand, their activities with the level of funding represented here. A major task facing directors of development programs is the need to work for increased funding of their programs in the next few years.

Even more significant than the above mentioned figures is the fact that overall financial support for development programs in two-year colleges may have declined since 1976. Table 12 shows that nine percent of the two-year colleges surveyed by Centra reported a decrease over the past two years in the proportion of their college's annual budget that was used for faculty development purposes. A similar group of colleges in 1979, however, report a 16 percent decrease in the proportion of the annual budget at their institution used for staff development over the last two years. With fewer colleges, 38 percent, as compared to 46 percent of the colleges in 1976, reporting increases in their staff development budgets over the last two years, it appears that development programs may be in a situation of trying to accomplish more with fewer dollars. This apparent erosion of financial support, particularly in the last two years, further emphasizes the need for program directors to find new ways to strengthen support for their program among all members of the academic community. One method for gaining such support would be to increase the quality of program evaluation. The next chapter in this

report suggests that improved program evaluation of a criterion-referenced or standards based nature may be the most important area for program improvement over the next few years.

Table 12

A Comparison of Funding Changes in the Proportion of the Annual Institutional Budget Used for Staff Development Over a Two-Year Period

Nature of Change	Two-Year Colleges (1979) N = 382 % Responding	Two-Year Colleges (1976) N = 326 % Responding
Increased	38	46
Decreased	16	9
Remained about the same	46	45

Chapter 5

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The evaluation of development programs should help justify the financial support they receive and also provide information to modify or improve services. As summarized in Table 13, only 25 percent of the institutions reported that they had evaluated their program or activities For whatever purpose, an additional 28 percent had done partial evaluations. Forty-two percent of the respondents indicated that their programs had not been evaluated at all, a surprising figure since this was the same percentage that Centra found for community college programs three years ago.

A closer look at Table 13 shows that more complete or full program evaluations were found in this study than in Centra's, 25 percent of the respondents reported full program evaluations in 1979 as compared to 19 percent in 1976. Partial program evaluations appear to be down in favor of more complete assessments. However, an alarmingly large number of staff development programs have still not been evaluated. With current and anticipated declines in resources, full program evaluations would appear to be a number one priority for many two-year college staff development programs. Sophisticated evaluation designs are needed to deal with such issues as accountability and the actual effects of various development activities.

A Criterion-Referenced Evaluation Model

Because of the need for improved evaluation of staff development programs, this study went a step beyond Centra's research in an attempt to identify some criteria or standards that staff development specialists

Table 13

Evaluation of Staff Development Programs or Activities in Community Colleges, 1976 and 1979

Has there been an evaluation of the staff development program or activities at your institution?

Possible Response Choices	Smith (1979) N = 413 Percentage	Centra (1976) N = 315 Responding
Yes	25	19
No	42	42
Only in part	28	35
No Response	5	4

are using or might use in evaluating the effectiveness of their programs. It also attempted to determine the impact of staff development programs by asking program coordinators to describe how well they felt their program(s) had met the criteria they were using.

Fifty-three evaluation criteria were identified. The criteria used were adapted from Evaluating Teaching Improvement Programs (1978) by William R. O'Connell and L. Richard Meeth. The criteria in this publication were developed by a group of staff development specialists who met in 1979 to discuss ways that teaching improvement programs should be evaluated. As a result of this group's conference, they proposed a

criterion-referenced approach for the evaluation of development programs. They outlined 97 evaluation criteria and grouped them into the following categories: (1) Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Program, (2) Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty, (3) Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Administration and, (4) Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Institution. In the following sections participant responses will be discussed to the criteria that were listed in this study in each of these four categories.

Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Program

O'Connell and Meeth (1978) suggest that staff development programs can be evaluated from many different perspectives. The ten criteria identified in this section (see Table 14) could be used to evaluate a staff development program, without specific reference to its impact on such groups as faculty, administrators, or the institution. The criteria listed here are ones that one might apply to any program within the community college.

Each evaluation criteria listed in Table 14 was being used by 60 percent (249 colleges) or more of the colleges, according to the respondents to this study. The criteria listed in this table represented 10 of the 17 most frequently used evaluation criteria mentioned in this research. It is interesting to note that the second most frequently used criteria was number three, "Goals and outcomes of the program are clearly specified." It is encouraging to see this emphasis on clearly defined goals since it is very difficult to conduct effective evaluation studies without a clear understanding of intended program outcomes. The most frequently mentioned criteria in this section was number five,

Table 14

Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Program

(N = 413)

Criteria	No. of Colleges Using Criteria	Estimated Achievement[a] Percentage Indicating Partially Met Criteria	Percentage Indicating Fully Met Criteria	Total
1. The staff development program is appropriate to institutional size, resources, goals, and needs.	283	63	11	74
2. The staff development program holds a significant place within the organization in terms of: role, line, budget, visibility, status.	279	51	14	65
3. Goals and outcomes of the program are clearly specified.	290	55	20	75
4. Program activities are determined by the goals of the program.	283	57	26	83
5. The content of each program activity is well ordered, comprehensive, and appropriate to the levels and abilities of the participants.	293	58	21	79
6. The variety of instructional resources and methods are congruent with the goals of the program and abilities of the participants.	267	60	19	79
7. Participants retain and made use of what is learned.	286	65	10	75
8. The program activities and operation are cost-effective in relation to goals and purposes.	258	52	24	76
9. The number of participants in the program's activities is sustained or increased in succeeding program offerings.	259	53	25	78
10. The program demonstrates a "ripple effect" within the institution.	253	53	21	74

[a]Percentages based only on institutions using the criteria.

"The content of each program activity is well ordered, comprehensive, and appropriate to the levels and abilities of the participants." This criteria suggests the importance of needs assessment in the planning and design of staff development programs. The most effective development programs will be the ones where the needs of the participants have been accurately assessed and addressed.

More than half of the program coordinators that used the criteria listed in Table 14 felt that they had at least partially met each of these criteria. However, much smaller percentages of respondents felt that they had fully met these same 10 criteria. For example, while 65 percent of the respondents who used criteria number 7 felt that they had "partially met" this criteria, only 10 percent were willing to say that, "Participants retain and make use of what is learned.", in their programs. This finding, along with the others listed in Table 14, indicate that in general staff development programs are not fully meeting established evaluation criteria. One would hope that in the future a greater percentage of college staff development officers using one or more of the criteria in Table 14 could report that they have fully met these standards.

Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty

Table 15 shows 25 criteria that could be used to evaluate the impact of a staff development program on two-year college faculty. As one can see the use of these criteria for evaluation purposes varies greatly in community college staff development programs. The four most frequently used criteria, according to the respondents in this study, were: "2.a. Faculty exhibit increased knowledge of and skills with alternative teaching methods: Use alternative media and new methodologies.", (263

colleges); "6. Faculty demonstrate improved communication skills through greater clarity of presentations, goals, and assisgnments.", (256 colleges); "7.c. Faculty use their knowledge and skills to improve teaching institution-wide: Create training programs for new instructors.", (240 colleges; "3.b. Faculty demonstrate stronger collegial relationships regarding teaching: Share with colleagues concerns about goals, problems and methods of teaching.", (232 colleges).

On six of the criteria in this category, 80 percent or more of the respondents indicated that their programs for faculty had either "partially" or "fully met" the standard. These criteria and the combined percentage of "partially" or "fully met" responses were as follows: "7.c. Faculty demonstrate improved communication skills through greater clarity of presentations, goals, and assignments.", (91 percent) ; "3.b. Faculty demonstrate stronger collegial relationships regarding teaching: Share with colleagues concerns about goals, problems, and methods of teaching.", (87 percent); "2.a. Faculty exhibit increased knowledge of and skills with alternative teaching methods: Use alternative media and new methodologies.", (88 percent); "8.d. Faculty demonstrate more responsiveness to individual student interests, expectations, and backgrounds: More attention to student concerns about vocational identity.", (82 percent); "8.a. Faculty demonstrate more responsiveness to individual student interests, expectations, and backgrounds. More attention to student personal needs and values.", (81 percent); and "6 Faculty demonstrate improved communication skills through greater clarity of presentations, goals, and assignments.", (81 percent). In considering the reported achievement of these criteria, one should keep in mind that very

few of the respondents indicated that these standards were fully met. At best, the findings in this section suggest that staff development programs still have a long way to go in demonstrating or proving the impact of their programs on faculty.

Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Administration

Table 16 depicts seven criteria that staff development officers or committees could use in assessing the impact of their programs on their college administration. According to the respondents, the most frequently used criterion in this category was item 4, "Administrators provide an adequate budget for staff improvement suitable to the goals, purposes, scope, and size of the institution." Two hundred and sixty-four program directors reported using this criteria in the evaluation of their development program. It is interesting to note that while this is a frequently used criteria, it has not been met with the same success as some of the other criteria listed in Table 16. Only 50 percent of the respondents indicated that they had "partially met" this criteria, and an even smaller percentage, 15 percent, said they had "fully met" the criteria. The finding here is consistent with the earlier finding which indicated that funding for staff development programs may be on the decline in two-year colleges.

Respondents indicate that they have had their greatest success in meeting criteria 5. "Administrators justify the staff development program inside and outside of the institution." Thirty-one percent of the respondents indicated that they had "fully met" this criteria. Apparently, a fairly large number of staff development personnel feel that their administrators are speaking out in support of development programs.

Table 15

Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria

for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty

(N = 413)

Criteria	No. of Colleges Using Criteria	Estimated Achievement[a] Percentage Indicating Partially Met Criteria (%)	Percentage Indicating Fully Met Criteria (%)	Total of Combined Percentages (%)
1. Faculty identify themselves more strongly as teachers:				
a. Increased reading about teaching.	179	53	2	55
b. More conversation about teaching.	197	63	13	76
c. More adequate vocabulary for describing teaching.	166	51	6	57
d. More writing about teaching.	159	28	2	30
2. Faculty exhibit increased knowledge of and skills with alternative teaching methods:				
a. Use alternative media, new methodologies.	263	77	11	88
b. Demonstrate improved performance.	231	69	8	77
3. Faculty demonstrate stronger collegial relationships regarding teaching:				
a. Encourage colleagues and assist them in solving their problems.	218	69	9	78
b. Share with colleagues concerns about goals, problems, and methods of teaching.	232	74	13	87
4. Faculty exhibit increased understanding of themselves as teachers:				
a. Increased satisfaction in teaching.	199	59	8	78
b. More enjoyment in teaching.	195	55	10	65

Table 15 (cont.)

Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria

for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty

(N = 413)

Criteria	No. of Colleges Using Criteria	Estimated Achievement[a] Percentage Indicating Partially Met Criteria (%)	Percentage Indicating Fully Met Criteria (%)	Total of Combined Percentages (%)
c. Less disdainful about teaching and students.	181	55	11	66
d. More self-conscious about inadequacies in teaching.	198	62	8	70
e. Evidence of attempts to clarify assumptions about teaching and learning.	192	63	7	70
f. Exhibit enthusiasm for content and instructional methods.				
5. Faculty demonstrate evidence of professional self-renewal.	205	67	11	78
6. Faculty demonstrate improved communication skills through greater clarity of presentations, goals, and assignments.	256	70	11	81
7. Faculty use their knowledge and skills to improve teaching institution-wide:				
a. Support activities of the teaching improvement program	225	65	8	73
b. Are involved in reorganizing course or department curriculum.	217	68	7	75
c. Create training programs for new instructors.	240	71	20	91
8. Faculty demonstrates more responsiveness to individual student interests, expectations, and backgrounds.				
a. More attention to student personal needs and values.	178	68	13	81
b. More informal faculty interaction with students.	231	61	13	74
c. More attention to student concerns about personal identity.	202	56	8	64

Table 15 (cont.)

Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria
for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty
(N = 413)

Criteria	No. of Colleges Using Criteria	Estimated Achievement[a] Percentage Indicating Partially Met Criteria (%)	Estimated Achievement[a] Percentage Indicating Fully Met Criteria (%)	Estimated Achievement[a] Total of Combined Percentages (%)
d. More attention to student concerns about vocational identity.	216	69	13	82
e. More effort to foster student interpersonal relationships.	196	56	9	65
f. More effort to facilitate informed student decision-making for course selection and utilization.	214	61	13	74
9. Faculty apply evaluation criteria, standards, and methodologies that are clear and appropriate to the goals of the learning experience.	214	72	3	75

[a]Percentages based only on institutions using the criteria.

Table 16

Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria for Judging Effect on the Administration

(N = 413)

Criteria	No. of Colleges Using Criteria	Estimated Achievement[a] Percentage Indicating Partially Met Criteria (%)	Percentage Indicating Fully Met Criteria (%)	Total of Combined Percentages (%)
1. Administrators increase awareness of the importance of teaching.	249	68	15	83
2. Administrators increase knowledge of staff objectives.	244	67	14	81
3. Administrators increase knowledge of needs, resources, barriers to, and strategies for faculty improvement.	259	68	15	83
4. Administrators provide an adequate budget for staff improvement and suitable to the goals, purposes, scope, and size of the institution.	264	50	15	65
5. Administrators justify the staff development program inside and outside the institution.	252	51	31	82
6. Administrators are better able to educate potential supporters and attract funds for staff development.	213	49	9	58
7. Administrators establish increased rewards for effective staff performance.	225	43	7	50

[a]Percentages based only on institutions using the criteria.

Respondents also feel that they have had moderate success in increasing administrator awareness and knowledge in the area of staff development. This is evidenced by their achievement responses to items 1-3 in Table 16.

Only 50 percent of those surveyed felt that this had either "partially" or "fully met" criteria number 17 in Table 16 "Administrators establish increased rewards for effective staff performance." A large number of staff development directors feel that there is continued need for improvement in this area.

Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Institution

There has been considerable interest in determining the impact of staff development programs on institutions in recent years. Table 17 lists ten criteria that are being used by two-year colleges to measure such impact. The respondents reported that their most frequently used criterion in this area was: "6. Staff morale is improved.". A total of 256 colleges reported that they used this criterion as one of their standards for judging the quality of their staff development program. One of the problems with this criterion, and some of the others listed in this table and in previous tables throughout this chapter, is the very general nature in which the criteria are stated. Only in a few instances do we see in the ten criteria reviewed here, and in the 53 criteria outlined in this chapter, very specific objectively measurable standards. Ways will need to be found to measure the achievement of most of the criteria in this study, if these criteria are to be truly useful in future evaluation studies.

Item 2. in Table 17 provides a good example of how an

evaluation criterion can be stated in measurable terms. In times of declining resources one might hope that a staff development program might change college curriculum costs so that the same course offerings could be offered for less money than in the past. It is obvious from the data in Table 17 that a much smaller number of colleges are using this criterion 124 colleges, and with much less reported success. The lack of use of this particular standard and ones like it, items 2.b. - 2.d., may be due to the unwillingness of staff development officers to be very specific about their anticipated program outcomes. The lack of success in meeting these same criteria, particularly criteria 2.a. - 2.c., is probably due to the difficulty in cutting costs in times of declining resources and enrollments when faculty salaries are likely to comprise 70-90 percent of the college's budget. One can offer fewer sections of the same course, for example, in times of declining enrollments but still have to pay the same salaries to faculty teaching the remaining courses.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed the respondents' use and reported achievement of 53 criteria for the evaluation of staff development programs in community colleges. The criteria were grouped into four areas: (1) Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Program, (2) Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty, (3) Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Administration, and (4) Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Institution. It was discovered that the most frequently used criteria, according to the staff development officers surveyed, all came from the first area, i.e., Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Program. Table 18 lists in rank order the five most frequently

Table 17

Use and Estimated Achievement of Evaluation Criteria

for Judging Program Effect on the Institution
(N = 413)

Criteria	No. of Colleges Using Criteria	Percentage Indicating Partially Met Criteria	Percentage Indicating Fully Met Criteria	Total of Combined Percentages (%)
1. As a consequence of improved teaching, graduates are better informed and more concerned citizens.	227	53	10	63
2. The curriculum costs are different because of the teaching improvement program:				
a. The same offerings for less money.	124	30	3	33
b. More offerings for the same money.	137	36	9	45
c. More offerings for less money.	122	29	5	34
d. Higher quality offerings for more money.	146	47	10	57
3. Graduates of the institution are more employable.	227	54	15	69
4. Graduates of the institution are motivated to continue learning and are more fulfilled as persons.	220	61	10	71
5. The goals of institution are changed, with more emphasis being placed on teaching and learning.	210	62	12	74
6. Staff morale is improved.	256	69	7	76
7. The same staff in all positions are more productive for the same personnel expenditure.	211	59	5	64

[a]Percentages based only on institutions using the criteria.

used of the 53 criteria studied. It is interesting to note that not one of the five most frequently used evaluation criteria in Table 18 is directly related to the effect or impact of staff development programs on college faculty members, administrators, or institutions. At this time, the emphasis in the evaluation of staff development programs in two-year colleges does not appear to be as much on program impact as it is on having a well-organized, growing and visible program. One might have predicted this finding because of the relatively new emphasis the whole staff development effort has received in two-year colleges. In the 1970's staff development officers have no doubt focused their attention more on program development than program evaluation. In the 1980's it is suggested that this emphasis will have to change with the directors of development programs devoting a great deal more of their time and resources to program evaluation. Such a change in priorities will be necessary to halt the previously mentioned declining resources for staff development programs and to win further support for this most important program.

On the positive side, it should be noted that the five criteria listed in Table 18 are consistent with some of the best theory on program development and evaluation in the field of higher education. The goals and outcomes, for example, of any staff development program should be clearly specified before a program can be adequately evaluated in terms of both intended and unintended outcomes or effect.

A second major finding reported in this chapter was that the most frequently used criteria were not necessarily the most frequently met. As one can see from Table 19, three of the six criteria reported to be

Table 18

Rank Ordering of the Five Most Frequently Used Criteria for the Evaluation of Community College Staff Development Programs

(N = 413)

	Criteria	No. of Colleges Using the Criteria
1.	The content of each program activity is well-ordered, comprehensive, and appropriate to the levels and abilities of the participants. (Table 14, #5)	293
2.	Goals and outcomes of the program are clearly specified. (Table 14, #3)	290
3.	Participants retain and make use of what is learned. (Table 14, #7)	286
4.	The staff development program is appropriate to institutional size, resources, goals, and needs. (Table 14, #4)	283
5.	The staff development program holds a significant place within the organization in terms of: role, line, budget, visibility, status. (Table 14, #2)	279

Table 19

Rank Ordering of Six Most Frequently Met Criteria for the Evaluation of Community College Staff Development Programs (N = 413)

Criteria	Percentage of Respondents Reporting "Partially" or "Fully" Met (%)	No. of Colleges Using Criteria
1. Faculty are involved in reorganizing course or department curriculum. (Table 15, #7c)	91	240
2. Faculty use alternative media, new methodologies. (Table 15, #2a)	88	263
3. Faculty share with colleagues concerns about goals, problems, and methods of teaching. (Table 15, #3b)	87	232
4. Program activities are determined by the goals of the program. (Table 14, #4)	83	283
5. Administrators increase knowledge of needs, resources, barriers to, and strategies for faculty improvement. (Table 16, #3)	83	259
6. Administrators increase awareness of the importance of teaching. (Table 16, #1)	83	249

[a]Percentages based only on institutions usirg the criteria.

the most frequently met are criteria that were used to judge the effect of programs on the two-year college faculty, items 1-3. Two other criteria, items 5 and 6, are criteria that were used to judge the effect on administrators. Only one of the most frequently used criteria were from the list of ten items used for judging the staff development program itself. Ninety-one percent of the respondents in 240 colleges using the criterion, "Faculty are involved in reorganizing course or department curriculum", reported either "partially" or "fully" meeting this criterion. Relatively speaking, this was the most frequently met evaluation criteria according to the respondents.

The data reported in Table 19 are significant because they do suggest that, at least in the eyes of program directors, development programs are having an impact on full-time faculty and administrators. More research is needed to determine if faculty and administrators share these same perceptions, and to determine the specific nature of program effects.

Chapter 6

SOME CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A variety of goals, practices, and evaluation criteria currently exist in the community college staff development movement, many of which have emerged in the 1970's. How effective these components are is not yet entirely known, but it would appear that more complete program evaluation is taking place. The views of people who direct or are knowledgeable about development activities at 413 two-year colleges were the basis of this report. Their perceptions of the goals, practices, and evaluation criteria in use on their campuses, while probably not free of bias, help to shed further light on this important area. Some conclusions, implications, and recommendations follow.

Goal Setting

At least thirty-one different goal statements are being used in two-year colleges throughout the country. These goals represent a wide range of programs and activities that are attempting to meet the development needs of full-time faculty, administrators, part-time faculty, other academic support staff such as counselors and librarians, and non-academic support personnel such as clerical staff members, etc. At first glance, it would appear that staff development programs in community colleges are trying to meet the development needs of more member of their academic communities. More careful analysis of the use of these goals, however, shows that the emphasis in community college staff development programs remains on meeting the needs of full-time faculty. The implication of this finding is that if community colleges wish to meet the

development needs of their total staff, more colleges will have to establish development goals for other than full-time teaching faculty.

Based on the findings reported in Chapter 2 of this report, it is recommended that:

1. Goals for community college staff development programs be set so as to reflect the total needs of each group of employees represented in the college.

2. The goals for community college staff development programs be limited in the future so that maximum program impact can be achieved in any given year.

3. Greater emphasis be placed on meeting development goals related to the needs of non-full-time teaching faculty, particularly part-time faculty and non-academic support staff.

4. Greater emphasis be given to development goals designed to help staff members prepare for future roles as opposed to present job responsibilities.

5. Development goals for staff development programs should include specific criteria for the evaluation of goal achievement.

Development Activities

Of the 48 staff development activities investigated, the respondents rated the following four as the most effective:

-Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.

-Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching.

-Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses.

-Faculty visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of the institution) to review educational programs and innovative projects.

These practices also received similar high effectiveness ratings in Centra's 1976 research. This finding suggests that, over time, these practices have remained as the ones likely to have the greatest impact

on staff behavior, particularly the full-time faculty in a two-year college.

Of the 35 development practices studied in both this project and Centra's, there has, however, been a decline in the effectiveness ratings which most of these items received from 1976 to 1979. This finding suggests that either new practices are taking their places or that colleges are focusing more of their development programming on a few of the more effective activities. In terms of new practices, this study examined 15 and found two that appear to merit inclusion in two-year college development programs. These two practices were:

-Non-academic staff tuition waiver program for individuals taking courses in the colleges.

-Needs assessment conducted to determine program goals and practices.

More research is needed to determine just how many different development activities are being used in community college staff development programs. This additional research should also attempt to determine the effectiveness of these practices as viewed by the various groups of personnel in the two-year college.

Based on the findings reported in Chapter 3 of this document, it is recommended that:

1. Staff development practices should parallel the staff development goals of the college in order to have the greatest programming impact on the college and its various staff members.

2. Those development practices that have proven the most effective over the years for enhancing student learning and for improving community college curriculum and instruction programs should be selected over practices that have not been evaluated.

3. A staff development needs assessment of all college staff members should precede the adoption of specific development activities for a college's annual staff development program. Activities then should be selected on the basis of need and the

goals of the institution so that there is a match between institutional and individual needs.

4. Each staff development program contain at least one program for each major personnel group in the college.

5. Whenever possible, each staff member should be offered a variety of staff development activities to choose from. Just as students have different learning styles and rates, so do faculty; thus, the need for a variety of approaches.

6. The use of professional and personal development plans (sometimes called growth contracts) for all staff members be considered as a way of individualizing development for each staff member. (Smith, 1976)

7. More research be conducted to determine the perceptions of recipients of staff development programs as to the usefulness of various practices.

Participation, Organization, and Funding

Generally, there appears to have been little increase in the number of full-time community college faculty involved in staff development programs since 1976. Participation rates for various groups of full-time faculty in this study were about the same as Centra (1976) found in his research. There may, however, have been an increase in other than full-time faculty involvement in staff development programs over the last few years. This study, for example, found over half of the colleges with development programs reporting half or more of their college administrators involved in development activities. Other groups showing some involvement that were not investigated by Centra (1976) included part-time faculty, clerical staff, and other non-academic support staff. If there has been an increased representation of these groups, then the development programs in two-year institutions are becoming more truly staff development, as opposed to faculty development, ventures. It is obvious,

however, that many staff members have yet to be served by their college's development program.

The study's finding that over half of all the community colleges with development programs now have a unit or person responsible for staff development is a positive trend. The implication from this finding is that staff development programs are increasingly being viewed as vital to the effective operation of two-year colleges. The other implication is that many colleges with staff development programs still need to find better ways to coordinate and administer this important administrative responsibility.

The low level of funding, usually less than one percent of the college's budget, and the finding that fewer staff development programs are reporting funding increases than in 1976, have major implications for community college staff development efforts. Staff development coordinators and directors are going to have to find ways to increase the financial base of their programs or they are likely to experience declines in program quality in times of monetary inflation and declining financial resources. The increase of consortium arrangements since 1976 for staff development purposes found in this research may be one way that staff development officers are attempting to maintain program quality in times of declining funds.

Based on these findings and others reported in Chapter 4, it is recommended that:

1. Community colleges find new ways to involve more of their staff members in development programs, particularly part-time faculty and non-teaching staff.

2. Each community college establisn a unit and person responsible for staff development. This unit should be highly visible in

the institution with its director reporting to a college dean or other chief academic officer.

3. More colleges set aside at least two percent of their budgets for staff development activities and programs. This is the amount of funding that has been allocated to staff development programs in Florida's community colleges since 1968, a system of 28 community colleges that has one of the finest staff development programs in the country.

Program Evaluation

The most glaring shortcoming of staff development programs in community colleges in 1976 was the absence of comprehensive program evaluation. This weakness remains today, with only 25 percent of the colleges in this study reporting that there has been a complete evaluation done of their programs. There has been little increase in evaluation activity in community college staff development programs since 1976 with 42 percent of the colleges surveyed in this study and Centra's reporting "no evaluation" of their programs. While many colleges report using a wide range of the 53 different evaluation criteria listed in this study, few colleges were able to report that these criteria were "fully met" The implications of these findings are that it is unlikely that the quality of and support for staff development programs in this segment of higher education will improve greatly until more evaluations are conducted.

Major recommendations coming from this section of the report are that:

1. Each community college that has not done so already should undertake a complete evaluation of their staff evelopment program in an effort to determine its impact on the institution and its effectiveness in meeting staff needs.

2. A criterion-referenced model be used in future evaluations of staff development programs. (The findings in this study suggest that many colleges are already adopting criteria to

determine the effect of their development activities on staff members. What is needed now is a more consistent application of this approach with more specific criteria or standards stated in terms of outcomes and tied to program goals and activities.)

3. Staff development officers set aside part of their annual budgets, perhaps 5-10 percent, for program evaluation.

4. The approximately 100 colleges who reported complete evaluations of their staff development programs be studied. The purpose of such a study would be to determine the benefits of such evaluations and to describe some evaluation designs that other two-year college staff development officers may wish to emulate.

A Final Word

Staff development programs have become an established part of some 35-40 percent of all community colleges, according to data gathered in this study. Increasingly, the emphasis in these programs is on meeting the needs of all staff members and not just the needs of full-time faculty. This is an appropriate trend and one in which the community colleges are serving as leaders for other segments of higher education. Whether or not this upsurge of staff development activity which began in the 1970's will continue into this new decade, is a question that remains to be answered.

Whether two-year colleges continue to support and foster development programs may very well depend on the demonstrated impact of these programs. It is hoped that this report will stimulate more colleges to evaluate the impact of their programs and that data from his research will prove useful to colleges seeking new ways to improve their staff development programs.

References

Benoit, Richard J. Characteristics and Attitudes of Florida Community College Faculty. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1978.

Centra, John A. Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, November 1976.

Eble, K. Career Development of the Effective College Teacher. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, November 1971.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment. Change Publication, 1974

Hammons, Jim; Wallace, Terry H. Smith; and Watts, Gordon Staff Development in the Community College: A Handbook. Topical Paper Number 66. Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1978.

O'Connell, William R., Jr. and Meeth, L. Richard. Evaluating Teaching Improvement Programs. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, National Teaching Program, 1978.

Smith, Albert B. Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education, 1976.

Appendix A

INITIAL LETTER AND SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE:

SURVEY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

April, 1979

Dear Academic Dean:

We are undertaking a national survey of two-year college staff development programs and need your assistance. The project is supported by the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD), one of several councils of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). Its purpose is to describe the goals, programs, and outcomes of existing programs.

Specifically, we would like to know if your institution has what you would consider an organized program or set of practices for staff development and for improving instruction. If you have such a program, we would like you to give the enclosed questionnaire and pre-stamped, return-addressed envelope to the coordinator or person most knowledgeable about it. We are interested in knowing of the program even if it is not institution-wide.

If yours is a multicampus college and you have two or more coordinators for campus-based staff development programs, then we would appreciate it if you could have the enclosed questionnaire duplicated and sent to each coordinator for completion and returned to us. If you also have a district office coordinator for staff development programs, we would like to have you request that he complete a copy of the enclosed questionnaires as well. If your college does not have an organized program or set of practices for staff development or instructional improvement, please write "NO PROGRAM AT THIS TIME" across the top of the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the pre-stamped envelope.

Thank you for your help. We will be publishing a summary of our findings and expect that this report will be of interest to you and your staff.

Sincerely,

Al Smith, Project Director
Institute of Higher Education

enclosure

April 1979

SURVEY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

Return to: Institute of Higher Education
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32 611
ATTN: Al Smith

Code No. ____

Dear Colleague:

We are undertaking a national survey of staff development programs at two-year colleges and we need your assistance. The project is supported by the National Council for Staff, Program and Organization Development (NCS-POD), one of several Councils of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). Its purpose is to describe the goals, programs, and outcomes of existing programs.

Thank you for your help in completing this questionnaire. It should take between 30-45 minutes of your time. Please return your completed copy within the next two weeks. We will be publishing a summary of our findings and expect that this report will be of interest to you and your staff.

Sincerely,

Al Smith
Project Director

I. STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Below are thirty-one staff development goal statements taken from the literature and/or inferred from conversations with practitioners. Which of these goals are a part of your staff development program. CHECK ALL THAT APPLY (Staff is defined here as all employees of the college, unless used otherwise).[1]

Check Your Goals Here

1. To increase staff (faculty, administrator, support personnel, clerical, etc.) responsiveness to student needs. ____

[1] The survey goals used here have been adapted with permission from those used by Dr. Robert T. Blackburn and his staff in their 1979 Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education grant on the assessment of faculty development programs, The University of Michigan Center for the Study of Higher Education, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48109.

Check Your Goals Here

2. To increase the effectiveness of part-time faculty ____

3. To provide professional development opportunities for the college's administrative staff. ____

4. To increase academic innovation. ____

5. To increase administrators' knowledge of the needs, resources, barriers to, and strategies for teaching improvement. ____

6. To facilitate a staff member's ability to participate in institutional decision-making. ____

7. To help staff retrain for assuming responsibilities in new areas. ____

8. To increase the faculty's knowledge about the teaching-learning process. ____

9. To create a climate in which the attainment of effective teaching is an ongoing concern. ____

10. To reduce student attrition. ____

11. To acquaint staff with the distinct mission and objectives of their institution. ____

12. To encourage staff to examine their central values and beliefs concerning education or work. ____

13. To enhance the staff's personal growth and self-actualization. ____

14. To initiate a periodic review of the performance of all staff members. ____

15. To provide professional development opportunities for the college's academic support staff, i.e., counselors librarians, etc. ____

16. To increase staff interpersonal skills. ____

17. To increase staff productivity. ____

18. To improve the faculty's ability to evaluate student performance. ____

19. To increase student motivation to learn. ____

20. To increase the faculty's repertoire of teaching methods. ____

Check Your Goals Here

21. To improve the faculty's ability to plan and develop courses of instruction designed to facilitate the achievement of clearly articulated objectives. ____

22. To stimulate and assist academic departments in meeting their goals. ____

23. To acquaint staff with current issues and trends in higher education. ____

24. To increase interpersonal contact and a sense of community among staff. ____

25. To improve the performance of non-academic staff, i.e., clerical, maintenance personnel, etc. ____

26. To instill a sense of importance about teaching and a sense of personal and professional worth about teaching. ____

27. To maximize the use of available teaching-learning resources ____

28. To increase staff satisfaction with their work. ____

29. To renew faculty interest in teaching. ____

30. To increase student learning. ____

31. To increase the faculty's skills in instruction. ____

32. Other (write in)_____ ____

_____

II. STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES[1]

Listed below are a number of practices that might be used to help staff develop in their variety of roles. Of the following practices which you have used, please indicate how effective you feel they have been as development practices. (Circle appropriate responses.)

---

[1]Survey questions from: John A. Centra, Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities. Copyright (c) 1976 by Educational Testing Service. Adapted and reprinted by permission with some new additions.

Response Key

0 Absolutely no idea of its effectiveness
1 Not very effective (or worthwhile)
2 Somewhat effective
3 Effective
4 Very effective (or worthwhile)

Practice (If you would like to comment about any practice, please do so below)	Estimation of Effectiveness (Respond only if used)
A. Workshops, Seminars, Programs	
1. Workshops or presentations that explore various methods or techniques of instruction.	0 1 2 3 4
2. Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field.	0 1 2 3 4
3. Workshops or seminars dealing with new or different approaches to develop curricula.	0 1 2 3 4
4. Workshops, seminars, or programs to acquaint staff with goals of the institution and types of students enrolled.	0 1 2 3 4
5. Workshops, seminars, or programs to improve the management of departmental operations.	0 1 2 3 4
6. Workshops or program in faculty affective development.	0 1 2 3 4
7. Workshops, seminars, or short courses for administrators.	0 1 2 3 4
8. Workshops, seminars, or short courses for non-academic staff.	0 1 2 3 4
9. Workshops, seminars, or short courese for part-time faculty.	0 1 2 3 4

Other workshops, seminars, etc. (please list and comment on effectiveness.)
Comment about aabove practices:

Practice (If you would like to comment about any practice, please do so below.)	Estimation of Effectiveness (Respond only if used)				
	Absolutely No Idea	Not Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective
B. Analysis or Assessment Practices					
1. Systematic ratings of instruction by students used to help faculty improve.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment form).	0	1	2	3	4
3. Systematic teaching or course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purposes.	0	1	2	3	4
4. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching.	0	1	2	3	4
6. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction.	0	1	2	3	4
7. Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement.	0	1	2	3	4
8. "Master teachers" or senior faculty work closely with new or apprentice teachers.	0	1	2	3	4
9. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members.	0	1	2	3	4
10. Faculty evaluation of college administrators.	0	1	2	3	4
11. Annual evaluation for all college staff members.	0	1	2	3	4
12. Professional and personal development plans for all staff members.	0	1	2	3	4

Other types of analysis or assessment practices (list with estimates of effectiveness). Comments about above practices:

	Estimation of Effectiveness (Respond only if used)				
C. Media, Technology, Course Development	No Idea	Not Very	Somewhat	Effective	Very Eff.
1. Specialist on campus to assist faculty in use of audio-visual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid (e.g., programmed learning or computer-assisted instruction.)	0	1	2	3	4
3. Specialists to assist faculty in constructing tests or evaluating student performance.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Specialist to assist individual faculty in instructional or course development by consulting on course objectives and course design.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Specialist to help faculty develop teaching skills such as lecturing or leading discussions, or to encourage use of different teaching-learning strategies such as individualized instruction.	0	1	2	3	4
6. Outside consultants to assist administrators with latest technology and management practice.	0	1	2	3	4
7. Specialists on campus to assist part-time faculty with media, technology, and course development.	0	1	2	3	4
8. Outside consultants to assist non-academic support staff in using latest technology and practice.	0	1	2	3	4

Other types of media, technology, or course development practices. Comments about above practices:

	Estimation of Effectiveness (Respond only if used)				
	No idea	Not very	Somewht	Effect.	Very Ef
D. Miscellaneous Practices					
1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Faculty visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this institution) to review educational programs or innovative projects.	0	1	2	3	4
3. Faculty take courses offered by colleagues.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Personal counseling provided individual faculty members on career goals and other personal development areas.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Sabbatical leaves for administrators.	0	1	2	3	4
6. Paid or unpaid leaves for non-academic staff for professional development purposes.	0	1	2	3	4
7. Non-academic staff tuition waiver program for individuals taking courses in the colleges.	0	1	2	3	4

Other miscellaneous practices. Comments about miscellaneous practices:

III. Of the following practices used at your institution, please estimate their effectiveness on the same scale of zero to four.

Response Key

0 Absolutely no idea of its effectiveness
1 Not very effective
2 Somewhat effective
3 Effective
4 Very effective

Practice	Respond only if practice exists				
(If you would like to comment about any practice, please do so below.)					
1. A specific calendar period is set aside for professional development.	0	1	2	3	4
2. There is periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not.	0	1	2	3	4
3. Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary.	0	1	2	3	4
4. A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or developmental purposes.	0	1	2	3	4

Practice	Respond only if practice exists				
5. Lighter than normal teaching load for first-year faculty.	0	1	2	3	4
6. Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area.	0	1	2	3	4
7. Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field.	0	1	2	3	4
8. Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.	0	1	2	3	4
9. "Visiting scholars" program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods.	0	1	2	3	4
10. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses.	0	1	2	3	4
11. There is a campus committee on staff or faculty development.	0	1	2	3	4
12. Needs assessment conducted to determine program goals and priorities.	0	1	2	3	4

Other practices. Comments about above practices:

IV. PARTICIPATION

What proportion of each of the following groups of staff members would you estimate has been generally most involved in development activities?

	Approximate Proportion (Circle one in each row) Very Few	Some	About Half	Most
1. Younger faculty in their first years of teaching.	1	2	3	4
2. Faculty with over 15 or 20 years of teaching experience.	1	2	3	4
3. Non-tenured faculty.	1	2	3	4
4. Tenured faculty	1	2	3	4
5. Good teachers who want to get better.	1	2	3	4
6. Faculty who really need to improve	1	2	3	4
7. Part-time faculty.	1	2	3	4
8. College administrators (including department chairpersons).	1	2	3	4
9. Clerical staff.	1	2	3	4
10. Other non-academic support staff.	1	2	3	4
11. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4

V. FUNDING

A. Approximately what proportion of the total money spent for staff development activities at your institution during the past year has come from each of the following sources. The total should add to 100 percent.

	Write in approximate percentage
1. Institutional general fund	_____%
2. Grant from federal government or foundation	_____%
3. Direct funds from the state	_____%
4. Other _____	_____%
Should add to:	100%

B. What percent of the total annual institutional (college) budget does #1, under A on the previous page, represent. (circle one)

1. 0-1%
2. 2-4%
3. 5-7%
4. 8-10%
5. Over 10%

C. Has the proportion of the annual institutional budget used for staff development (circle one):

1. Increased over the past two years?
2. Decreased over the past two years?
3. Remained about the same?

VI. ORGANIZATION

A. Does your institution have an on-campus person or unit(s) for staff development or instructional improvement (e.g., Office of Educational Development, Instructional Resource Unit, Teaching Improvement Unit, etc.)?

1. Yes 2. No

B. If yes, please list the title of the unit(s) and the number of full-time equivalent professional staff involved.

Title	Number
_____	_____
_____	_____

C. How long has it (have they) existed?

_____ (Number of years)

VII. Is your institution part of a consortium or regional group that concentrates on faculty development? (Circle response)

1. Yes 2. No

If yes, give the name. _____

VIII. Has there been an evaluation of the staff development program or activities at your institution? (Circle response)

1. Yes 2. No

If yes or in part, could you describe the evaluation below or provide a copy of the report if available?

IX. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.[1]

Listed below are a number of criteria or standards that might be used in evaluating your staff development program. Of the following evaluation criteria, which you have used, please indicate the degree to which they have been met.

Response Key

0 Absolutely no idea of our success
1 Not met
2 Partially met
3 Fully met

Criteria (If you would like to comment about any criterion, please do so below.)	Respond only if criterion is used

[1]The criteria used here have been adapted and reprinted from Evaluating Teaching Improvement Programs (1978) by William R. O'Connell, Jr. and L. Richard Meeth with permission of the Council on Learning and Change Magazine Press, NBW Tower, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801.

A. Criteria for Judging the Staff Development Program	No idea	Not met	Part. met	Fully met
1. The staff development program is appropriate to institutional size, resources, goals, and needs.	0	1	2	3
2. The staff development program holds a significant place within the organization in terms of: role, line, budget, visibility, status.	0	1	2	3
3. Goals and outcomes of the program are clearly specified.	0	1	2	3
4. Program activities are determined by the goals of the program.	0	1	2	3
5. The content of each program activity is well-ordered, comprehensive, and appropriate to the levels and abilities of the participants.	0	1	2	3
6. The variety of instructional resources and methods are congruent with the goals of the program and abilities of the participants.	0	1	2	3
7. Participants retain and make use of what is learned.	0	1	2	3
8. The program activities and operation are cost-effective in relation to goals and purposes.	0	1	2	3
9. The number of participants in the program's activities is sustained or increased in succeeding program offerings.	0	1	2	3
10. The program demonstrates a "ripple effect" within the institution.	0	1	2	3

Other criteria. Comments about above criteria:

B. Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Faculty				
1. Faculty identify themselves more strongly as teachers:				
a. Increased reading about teaching.	0	1	2	3
b. More conversation about teaching.	0	1	2	3
c. More adequate vocabulary for describing teaching.	0	1	2	3
d. More writing about teaching.	0	1	2	3
2. Faculty exhibit increased knowledge of and skills with alternative teaching methods:				
a. Use alternative media, new methodologies.	0	1	2	3
b. Demonstrate improved performance.	0	1	2	3
3. Faculty demonstrate stronger collegial relationships regarding teaching.				
a. Encourage colleagues and assist them in solving their problems.	0	1	2	3
b. Share with colleagues concerns about goals, problems, and methods of teaching.	0	1	2	3

	No idea	Not met	Part. met	Fully met
4. Faculty exhibit increased understanding of themselves as teachers:				
a. Increased satisfaction in teaching.	0	1	2	3
b. More enjoyment in teaching.	0	1	2	3
c. Less disdainful about teaching and students.	0	1	2	3
d. More self-conscious about inadequacies in teaching.	0	1	2	3
e. Evidence of attempts to clarify assumption about teaching and learning.	0	1	2	3
f. Exhibit enthusiasm for content and instructional methods.	0	1	2	3
5. Faculty demonstrate evidence of professional self-renewal.	0	1	2	3
6. Faculty demonstrate improved communication skills through greater clarity of presentations, goals, and assignments.	0	1	2	3
7. Faculty use their knowledge and skills to improve teaching institution-wide:				
a. Support activities of the teaching improvement program.	0	1	2	3
b. Are involved in reorganizing course or department curriculum.	0	1	2	3
c. Create training programs for new instructors.	0	1	2	3
8. Faculty demonstrates more responsiveness to individual student interests, expectations, and backgrounds.				
a. More attention to student personal needs and values.	0	1	2	3
b. More informal faculty interaction with students	0	1	2	3
c. More attention to student concerns about personal identity.	0	1	2	3
d. More attention to student concerns about vocational identity.	0	1	2	3
e. More effort to foster student interpersonal relationships.	0	1	2	3
f. More effort to facilitate informed student decision-making for course selection and utilization	0	1	2	3
9. Faculty apply evaluation criteria, standards, and methodologies that are clear and appropriate to the goal of the learning experience.	0	1	2	3

Comments about above criteria:

D. Criteria for Judging Program Effect on the Institution

	No idea	Not met	Part. met	Fully met
1. As a consequence of improved teaching, graduates are better informed and more concerned citizens.	0	1	2	3
2. The curriculum costs are different because of the teaching improvement program:	0	1	2	3
a. The same offerings for less money.	0	1	2	3
b. More offerings for the same money.	0	1	2	3
c. More offerings for less money.	0	1	2	3
d. Higher quality of offerings for more money.	0	1	2	3
3. Graduates of the institution are more employable.	0	1	2	3
4. Graduates of the institution are motivated to continue learning and are more fulfilled as persons.	0	1	2	3
5. The goals of institution are changed, with more emphasis being placed on teaching and learning.	0	1	2	3
6. Staff morale is improved.	0	1	2	3
7. The same staff in all positions are more productive for the same personnel expenditure.	0	1	2	3

Comments about above criteria:

X. Institutional Characteristics (Circle one in each category)

A. Source of control:

1. Private
2. Public

B. Religious affiliation:

1. None
2. Protestant
3. Catholic
4. Other religious group

C. Total student enrollment (full-time):

1. Under 1000
2. 1000-2500
3. 1000-5000
4. 5,000-10,000
5. 10,000-20,000
6. Over 20,000

Name of institution _____

Your name _____

Title _____

Finally, we invite you to include additional comments about the staff development program or practices at your institution--its basic strategy or emphasis, its most critical problems, etc. If there is a document that describes your program, you may want to forward a copy to us. Comments may be made on a separate sheet of paper.

Return to: Institute of Higher Education
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611
ATTN.: Al Smith

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION.